UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS TYLER DIVISION

STA-RITE INDUSTRIES, LLC	§	
F/K/A SHURFLO, LLC F/K/A/	§	
SHURFLO PUMP	§	
MANUFACTURING COMPANY,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	Civil Action No. 6:08-cv-59
	§	
v.	§	
	§	
ITT CORPORATION, ITT	§	
INDUSTRIES, FLOJET	§	
CORPORATION, ITT JABSCO,	§	
INC., AND RULE INDUSTRIES,	§	
INC.,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

VERDICT FORM

In answering these questions, you are to follow all of the instructions I have given you in the Charge of the Court.

- 1A. Did Sta-Rite, Inc. prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendants ITT Corporation, ITT Industries, Flojet Corporation, ITT Jabsco, Inc. and Rule Industries, Inc. literally infringed the claims of the patents listed below?
- 1B. Did Sta-Rite prove by clear and convincing evidence that Defendants' infringement, if any, was willful?

Answer "Yes" or "No" as to each claim in column 1A. For each claim you answer "Yes" in column 1A, in column 1B answer "Yes" or "No." If you answer "No" in column 1A, do not answer the corresponding column 1B.

	1A	1B
1403 D	(Literal Infringement)	(Willful Infringement)
'183 Patent:	Claim 10:	
	Claim 11:	

		1A	1B
	(Li Claim 12:	teral Infringement)	(Willful Infringement)
	Claim 13:		
	Claim 14:		
'882 Patent:			
	Claim 14:		
	Claim 15:		
	Claim 17		
'662 Patent:	Claim 5:		
'767 Patent:	Claim 18:	<u> </u>	
	Claim 21:		
	Claim 22:		
	Claim 23:		
'936 Patent:	Claim 1:		
	Claim 2:		
	Claim 3:		
	Claim 4:	- <u></u>	
	Claim 5:		
	Claim 6:		
	Claim 7:		
'437 Patent:	Claim 11:		

2.	Did Defendants ITT Corporation, ITT Industries, Flojet Corporation, ITT Jabsco and Rule Industries prove by clear and convincing evidence that any of the listed claims of the '183 patent are invalid for indefiniteness?
	Answer "Yes" or "No" for each listed claim:
	Claim 10:
	Claim 11:
	Claim 12:
	Claim 13:
	Claim 14:
3.	Did Defendants ITT Corporation, ITT Industries, Flojet Corporation, ITT Jabsco and Rule Industries prove by clear and convincing evidence that any of the listed claims of the '882 patent are invalid for indefiniteness?
	Answer "Yes" or "No" for each listed claim:
	Claim 14:
	Claim 15:
	Claim 17
4.	Did Defendants ITT Corporation, ITT Industries, Flojet Corporation, ITT Jabsco and Rule Industries prove by clear and convincing evidence that any of the listed claims of the '662 patent are invalid for indefiniteness?
	Answer "Yes" or "No" for each listed claim:
	Claim 5
5.	Did Defendants ITT Corporation, ITT Industries, Flojet Corporation, ITT Jabsco and Rule Industries prove by clear and convincing evidence that any of the listed claims of the '767 patent are invalid for indefiniteness?
	Answer "Yes" or "No" for each listed claim:
	Claim 18:
	Claim 21:
	Claim 22:

Claim 23:

6.	Did Defendants ITT Corporation, ITT Industries, Flojet Corporation, ITT Jabsco and Rule Industries prove by clear and convincing evidence that any of the listed claims of the '936 patent are invalid for indefiniteness?	
	Answer "Yes" or "	No" for each listed claim:
	Claim 1:	
	Claim 2:	
	Claim 3:	
	Claim 4:	
	Claim 5:	
	Claim 6:	
7.		ration, ITT Industries, Flojet Corporation, ITT Jabsco by clear and convincing evidence that any of the listed e invalid for indefiniteness?
	Answer "Yes" or "	No" for each listed claim:
	Claim 11:	
8.	and Rule Industries prove b	ration, ITT Industries, Flojet Corporation, ITT Jabsco by clear and convincing evidence that any of the listed below are invalid as anticipated?
	Answer "Yes" or "	No" for each listed claim:
'183 P		
	Claim 10:	
	Claim 11:	
	Claim 12:	
	Claim 13:	
	Claim 14:	
'882 P	atent: Claim 14:	
	Ciuiii 17.	

Claim 15:

	Claim 17	
'662 P	Claim 5:	
'767 P	atent: Claim 18:	,
	Claim 21:	
	Claim 22:	
	Claim 23:	
'936 P	atent: Claim 1:	,
	Claim 2:	
	Claim 3:	
	Claim 4:	
	Claim 5:	
	Claim 6:	
'437 P	atent: Claim 11:	
9.	and Rule Industries prove	oration, ITT Industries, Flojet Corporation, ITT Jabsco e by clear and convincing evidence that any of the valid as being obvious to a person of ordinary skill in cation was filed?
	Answer "Yes" or "	'No'' for each listed claim:
'183 P	atent: Claim 10:	
	Claim 11:	
	Claim 12:	
	Claim 13:	
	Claim 14:	

'882 I	Patent:	
	Claim 14:	
	Claim 15:	
	Claim 17	
'662 I	Patent: Claim 5:	
'767 I	Patent: Claim 18:	
	Claim 21:	
	Claim 22:	
	Claim 23:	
'936 I	Patent:	
	Claim 1:	
	Claim 2:	
	Claim 3:	
	Claim 4:	
	Claim 5:	
	Claim 6:	
'437 I	Patent: Claim 11:	
10.	Rite as damages adequate to have been infringed?	aid now in cash, do you find should be awarded to Stato compensate it for the patent claims you have found only award damages for those claims you find infringed damages for claims that you did not find infringed and
	Answer: \$	
—— DATE		FOREPERSON